



SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/286,413	08/05/94	MORRIS	S A94087US

E1M1/0116
SETH M NEHRBASS
PRAVEL HEWITT KIMBALL & KRIEGER
1177 WEST LOOP SOUTH 10TH FLOOR
HOUSTON TX 77027-9095

EXAMINER	
GIBSON, R	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2112	15

DATE MAILED:

01/16/97

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

a) ☒ is extended to run 4 months or continues to run _____ from the date of the final rejection

b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☒ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 1/8/97 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:

a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.

b. ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).

c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).

d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☐ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: _____

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because see attachment

5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☐ Other

M. L. Gellner

MICHAEL L. GELLNER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 110

Art Unit: 2112

Attachment to Paper #15 (the second Advisory Action)

The declarations filed under 37 CFR § 1.132 filed January 8, 1997 are insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1 and 3-22 based upon obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as set forth in the last Office action because: evidence that an invention would have been uneconomical to manufacture and market does not indicate that the invention would have been non-obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The failure to solve a long-felt need may be due to factors such as lack of interest or lack of appreciation of an invention's potential or marketability rather than want of technical know-how. *Scully Signal Co. v. Electronics Corp. of America*, 196 USPQ 657 (1st. Cir. 1977).

Gibson *RW*
January 13, 1997

M. L. Gellner

MICHAEL L. GELLNER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2100